

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Claims 1 – 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al.

5 **Response**

**Claim 1**

Watanabe teaches reading control information stored in a control track on an optical disc and then storing the retrieved control information into the control information storage section provided at a predetermined position in a memory. As shown in Watanabe Fig.11, 10 a memory 300 is configured to have a control information storage section. However, Watanabe further discloses using the CPU 21 to output an instruction to the arrangement control block 24 according to the control information stored in the control information storage section and then using the arrangement control block 24 to establish an optimum arrangement of the memories 300 and 400 according to the received instruction 15 (paragraphs [0134] and [0135]). As a result of this optimum arrangement, after the control information is stored in the control information storage section, the memory 300 is re-configured to have a specific memory arrangement as shown in Fig. 11. Furthermore, Watanabe also teaches that the control information of the optical disc includes defect 20 management information for a DVD-RAM, and linking information for a DVD-R/RW (paragraph [0135]). As can clearly be seen from the diagram, the control information stored in the control information storage section of the memory 300 is allocated to another memory 400, where the memory 400 shown in Fig. 11 has a defect management information storage region for DVD-RAM and a storage region for linking information for DVD-R. Therefore, control information initially stored in the memory 300 is deleted

after the arrangement control block 24 completes establishing an optimum arrangement of the memories 300 and 400. In short, the arrangement of the memory 300 that is capable of storing the control information is not fixed according to Watanabe's teachings.

The control information stored to the memory 400 is stored in a location according  
5 to the disc type of the currently loaded optical disc. This is clearly illustrated in Watanabe  
Fig. 11. Therefore, the arrangement of the memory 400 that is capable of storing the  
control information is not fixed according to Watanabe's teachings. Furthermore, as can  
be seen in Fig.11, different sizes of storage regions are allocated to the memory 400,  
therefore when a first disc is accessed, control information will not be written to the same  
10 address as control information of a second disc.

Claim 1 of the present application defines that the variable memory is able to store  
reading variables, and the arrangement of the claimed variable memory configured to  
store reading variables is fixed. In other words, regardless of the type of disc accessed,  
reading variables will be stored in a fixed area of the memory, and the arrangement of  
15 regions of the memory will always be the same. In light of these reasons, the applicant  
asserts Claim 1 has overcome the rejections under 102(e). Reconsideration of Claim 1 is  
respectfully requested.

#### Claims 2 – 4

Claims 2 – 4 are dependent on Claim 1. As the applicant believes Claim 1 has been  
20 placed in a position for allowance, claims 2 – 4 should also be found allowable.

#### Claim 5

In specification paragraph [0132], Watanabe teaches transmitting the determination  
result of the optical disc determination block to the CPU. In other words, the  
determination result, including identified disc type and class, is not stored into the

variable memory. The claimed limitations of Claim 5 are neither taught nor suggested by Watanabe's teachings. Additionally, Claim 5 is dependent on Claim 1. As the applicant believes Claim 1 has been placed in a position for allowance, Claim 5 should also be found allowable.

5 Claim 6

The Examiner claims that Watanabe discloses storing common variables in an area of the memory, wherein said common variables will not be overwritten when a new optical disc is accessed. The applicant asserts that this limitation is not taught by Watanabe, who discloses storing common variables in a predetermined area of the 10 memory (i.e., the control information storage section shown in Watanabe Fig. 10). This means that each time an optical disc is accessed, the common variables will be reproduced to the same area in the memory to overwrite old control information read from a previously loaded optical disc. The term 'fixed' refers to the location of the data, not the permanency of the data. The applicant therefore believes that Claim 6 should be 15 found allowable over the prior art.

Claim 7

Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 1. As the applicant believes Claim 1 has been placed in a position for allowance, Claim 7 should also be found allowable.

Claim 8

20 Claim 8 is a method claim comprising similar limitations to Claim 1, except that Claim 8 specifies reading data of a DVD. As the essential points of Claim 8 are the same as Claim 1, and the applicant believes Claim 1 has been placed in a position for allowance, Claim 8 should also be found allowable. Reconsideration of Claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9

Claim 9 is dependent on Claim 8. As the applicant believes Claim 8 has been placed in a position for allowance, Claim 9 should also be found allowable.

Claim 10

5 In light of the reasons detailed under Claim 5, the applicant asserts that the claimed limitations are neither taught nor suggested by Watanabe's teachings. Additionally, Claim 10 is dependent on Claim 8. As the applicant believes Claim 8 has been placed in a position for allowance, Claim 10 should also be found allowable.

Claim 11

10 Claim 11 discloses the common reading variables in the memory will not be replaced. For the reasons detailed under Claim 6, the applicant believes Claim 11 should be found allowable over the prior art. Furthermore, Claim 11 is dependent on Claim 8 and should be found allowable if Claim 8 is found allowable.

Claim 12

15 Claim 12 is dependent on Claim 8. As the applicant believes Claim 8 has been placed in a position for allowance, Claim 12 should also be found allowable.

Claim 13

20 Claim 13 is a method claim comprising similar limitations to claims 1 and 8, except that Claim 13 specifies the storing of writing variables. As the essential points of Claim 13 are the same as claims 1 and 8, and the applicant believes claims 1 and 8 have been placed in a position for allowance, Claim 13 should also be found allowable. Reconsideration of Claim 13 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/605,097  
Amdt. dated April 17, 2007  
Reply to Office action of February 20, 2007

Claims 14 and 15

Claims 14 and 15 are dependent on Claim 13. As the applicant believes Claim 13 has been placed in a position for allowance, Claims 14 and 15 should also be found allowable.

5    Claim 16

Claim 16 defines that reading variables and writing variables are separately stored in the variable memory. As Watanabe only discloses a memory where control information is stored in the same area of the memory, the applicant believes Claim 16 should be found allowable. Additionally, Claim 16 is dependent upon Claim 13, and should be allowed if  
10    Claim 13 is found allowable.

Claims 17 – 18

Claims 17 – 18 are dependent on Claim 13. As the applicant believes Claim 13 has been placed in a position for allowance, claims 17 – 18 should also be found allowable.

15    Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the final rejections and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

20

Appl. No. 10/605,097  
Amtd. dated April 17, 2007  
Reply to Office action of February 20, 2007

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 04.17.2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)